1.0

2.8

2.5

3.2

2.2

3.6

2.0

1.1

1.8

1.25

1.4

1.6

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

LEVEL II

ONR LONDON CONFERENCE REPORT

C-12-80

AD A098352

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

EUROPEAN WORKSHOP IN LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL
BEHAVIOR—UNIVERSITY OF ASTON MANAGEMENT CENTRE

J.G. HUNT

BRANCH
OFFICE
LONDON
ENGLAND

*Visiting Professor, University of Aston

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

81 4 30   038

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER C-12-80 ✓	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD -AC9835-2	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) EUROPEAN WORKSHOP IN LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL BEHAVIOR—UNIVERSITY OF ASTON MANAGEMENT CENTRE		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Conference
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER C-12-80
7. AUTHOR(s) J.G. Hunt		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH, BRANCH OFFICE LONDON Box 39 FPO NY 09510		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE 1980
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 23
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Character Traits	Management
Culture	Manipulation
Decision-making	Organizational Influence
Headship	Participation
Leadership	Politics

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

A sabbatical at the University of Aston Management Centre, Birmingham, UK, and visits to other similar UK and Dutch centers revealed major thrusts in the nature of organizational and management research in Europe.

In general, there is considerable research of this kind being conducted in Europe. Its flavor is summarized in this report.

The work differs from that being done in the United States in a number of ways. One is the emphasis on cross-national studies. There are a number ⟶

of such European projects involving centralized research designs but decentralized funding and implementation modes across institutions in different countries. While such research is done in the U.S., it does not play the dominant role demonstrated here. Neither is the centralized design, decentralized implementation mode common.

A second difference is the emphasis on research concerning work place participation. Though rare in the U.S., such schemes are commonplace in Europe. A third difference is in the way leadership research is treated in Europe and the U.S. Such work is more heterogeneous in Europe and is frequently treated as part of another project, not as a research area in its own right as in the U.S.

Accession For		
NTIS GRA&I	X	
DTIC TAB	☐	
Unannounced	☐	
Justification		
By		
Distribution/		
Availability Codes		
	Avail and/or	
Dist	Special	
A		

EUROPEAN WORKSHOP IN LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL BEHAVIOR—
UNIVERSITY OF ASTON MANAGEMENT CENTRE

INTRODUCTION

The European Workshop in Leadership and Managerial Behaviour was held at the University of Aston Management Centre on May 17th, 18th, and 19th, 1980. It was supported by the London Branch of the US Office of Naval Research and by the British Social Science Research Council.

The aims of the workshop were to:

(1) Bring together European and British academics active in the area broadly described as leadership and managerial behavior.

(2) Provide a forum for the discussion and exchange of ideas with emphasis on a constructive and supportive atmosphere.

(3) Explore the relationship of European ideas and activities to that of US scholars.

(4) Provide the basis for an informal European network of scholars within this area similar to that now existing in the US.

To meet these objectives a list of possible contributors was compiled after discussion with individuals familiar with those involved in the organizational behavior and psychology areas in Europe and Britain. The conference announcement was then distributed to these individuals who were also encouraged to contact the authors for names of other possible contributors (see Appendix I). The call was also circulated in the *EGOS Newsletter* and in the journal, *Leadership and Organizational Development.*

To supplement the European emphasis and provide additional perspective it was decided to invite a scholar in the area from the US to present a concluding overview.

As a result of these actions, approximately 30 persons - in addition to those from Aston - indicated their wish to attend the conference (see Appendix II for final list of participants). Almost all of these were involved in presentations with a few serving a discussant/integrative role.

To allow adequate presentation and discussion time among the large number of participants it was decided to organize dual concurrent sessions, each with an underlying thematic rationale. These were followed by short integrative sessions and concluded with several loosely structured discussion groups. These considerations are reflected in the program announcement (see Appendix III).

The content of the workshops was divided into eight thematic sessions (Appendix III). In the next section we summarize the details of each of these, link them into other literature where appropriate, and summarize key issues brought out in the discussion sessions. We then summarize the overview and the ensuing discussion and conclude with a summary and conclusions section. There we focus on issues cutting across sessions and compare and contrast the thrust of the work presented here with that in the US.

THEMES

Fundamental issues

This was one of the two parallel sessions that opened the conference. It was intended to deal with a wide range of conceptual, theoretical, political, and methodological issues. The debate focused on one major theme: the contributions of social psychology to the understanding of leadership. In addition, some suggestions were made as to future directions based upon a much wider literature, in particular, studies of managerial jobs and job behavior.

Dian Hosking presented a paper entitled "The Social Psychology of Leadership - Mark I." She began by noting that current theories of leadership effectiveness account for very little of the variance in work unit performance or individual outcomes (cf. Dublin *et al.* 1965; Kerr 1976; Pfeffer 1978). In her view this situation would not radically alter until theorists recognized - and acted on the recognition - that there was no one thing called leadership. What was needed was the development of mid-range theories having a defined and limited scope of application. Support for this position was drawn from diverse literatures, but emphasis was placed on the contributions - 'good' and 'bad' - made by social psychologists.

One major, positive contribution was seen to be provided by distinctions - now more than thirty years old - between leadership, headship, and management (cf. Gibb 1958; 1969). The work of social psychologists such as Katz and Kahn, and Jacobs, was also seen to be useful in developing the view that leadership may be exercised by more than one person in a given setting, and not necessarily by an appointed official. It was pointed out that most of this work was done many years ago and has since been largely ignored - certainly by researchers.

By comparison, social-psychologists' emphasis on leadership as a group phenomenon was seen to be less helpful in that it tended to focus on within-group relations to the neglect of other possible leadership domains. It was argued that leadership occurs in other forms of social organization (e.g., "groups" and "collections" and "classes" - see Gibb 1969 for distinctions); that these units might consist of subordinates and/or peers and/or superordinates; and that leaders might exercise leadership in more than one such unit. These arguments were supported and illustrated by reference to the work of persons such as Sayles (1964), Selznick (1957), and Stewart (1976).

It was also observed that social psychologists had on the whole focused on 'situational' as opposed to more macro dimensions of organization - size, technology, structural characteristics, etc. Arguments were given as to why such variables should be considered. In particular it was stressed that leadership probably means different things in different parts of an organization - consequently organizational characteristics would have to be included in research and theory development. Evidence in support of

this view was reviewed and deemed to constitute support for abandoning the search for a single, unified paradigm for leadership (see McCall 1977) and instead, seeking mid-range theories of circumscribed leadership phenomena.

Ian Morely had designed his contribution as a reply to the previous speaker and called it "The Social Psychology of Leadership - Mark II". The thrust of his response was on two fronts. The first dealt with the suggestion that social psychologists have encouraged a very limited view of leadership and the domains in which it might be exercised. He argued that while research might have concentrated on within-group interactions, representative social-psychological definitions of leadership do not preclude the study of leadership activities outside the group (contrast this view with, e.g., the definition adopted by Minzberg 1973).

Morley's second point was made in response to what he saw as the charge that since the work of Gibb, Katz, and Kahn, etc., few major contributions have been made by social psychologists in the area of leadership. Four major lines of inquiry were outlined, each of which was seen as being particularly relevant to an understanding of leadership at upper levels in an organization's hierarchy. A brief outline of each was given: Janis and Mann's analysis of "groupthink" and the types of leader behavior which appear to either promote or discourage it (Janis and Mann 1977); research in cognitive social psychology which emphasizes information processing and social judgement (see, e.g., Steinbruner 1974; Eiser 1980); studies of cognitive complexity (see, e.g., Streufert and Streufert 1979); and finally a "provocative" analysis of generalship (remote leadership) conducted by Dixon (1976).

From this review, Morely concluded that there is no single, small-group approach to leadership, and that there is recent work in social psychology that can inform our understanding of leadership. This apart, agreement was expressed with many of the "worries" and "prejudices" of the previous speaker, and a number of suggestions were offered as to the directions in which future work might proceed.

Neglected Aspects of Leadership and Managerial Behavior

The diverse contributions to this session provided an opportunity to discuss both theoretical and empirical concerns.

Rosemary Stewart presented some thoughts on "The Relevance of Research into Managerial Behaviour for Leadership Studies." First, she argued that the two areas have developed largely independently of each other. Different researchers have been attracted to each, a different literature base has been emphasized, and the questions of interest have been different. Those in leadership studies have traditionally been mainly psychologists using the predominant tools of their occupation: structured questionnaires and laboratory studies. They have tended to emphasize measurement.

Those in the managerial behavior area have, according to Stewart, tended to be smaller in number, to come from varied backgrounds, and to focus on the question of what it is that managers do. They have tended to develop insights from qualitative approaches with relatively little measurement emphasis.

Stewart went on to argue that the managerial behavior studies have led to a picture of managerial behavior quite different from that of classical management. Yet some of the newer leader behavior approaches which have attempted to branch out from the traditional leader behavior task and socio-emotional dimensions have tended to use behavior in the classical vein. She then pointed out what some of these additional behaviors might be and their potential importance for leadership studies.

Stewart concluded with a consideration of some of the conceptual and methodological problems that have arisen in managerial behavior research. She argued for a greater interest in construct development and in trying to understand the meaning of what is being measured in leadership studies.

The next presentation, by Cezary Wlodarczyk, "Some Doubts on the Leadership Studies Concept" was again a "think piece." He focused on issues that arose in designing a study to investigate leadership in the Polish occupational health service. Wlodarczyk essentially examined the question of the generality of traditional leader behavior dimensions across all organizational settings. To what extent are such behaviors setting specific? Traditional leadership contingency approaches tend to take the behaviors as given with their impact moderated by the situation. Wlodarczyk's question is a more basic one.

He described a typical occupational-health unit as having virtually no autonomy (objectives, procedures, and budgetary considerations are all determined outside the unit) and being a part of a tall, narrow, and extremely bureaucratic hierarchy. Virtually all managerial decisions are made outside the unit. However, since the units are health-care ones their employees are professionals with strongly held professional norms. The result, as in most such systems, is what Wlodarczyk terms "inwardly conflicting." He postulates that two key concerns involve the extent to which the leader should try to use direct action toward subordinates (where they hold strong professional competence norms and he has few direct rewards or sanctions at his disposal) or indirect action where the leader tries to influence those in a position to make decisions in the hierarchy. He questioned the adequacy of traditional leadership approaches under these circumstances.

The third contribution, "Inconvenient Findings: Loose Ends or Pointers?" by Tom Watson, unlike Stewart's and Wlodarczyk's, was empirical in nature. Again, though, it raised a question about the adequacy of traditional leadership approaches.

Watson started with a description of a study done in four English hospitals. Selected items from the LBDQ (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Stogdill 1974) were used to top consideration and initiating structure for physician, nurses, and paramedics. Self and superior ratings were obtained. C and IS were found to correlate 0.42 in both samples. Ratings of self and leader were similar for nurses but not for physicians.

Watson then described an industrial sample where leader behavior, use of time, and performance indicators were measured. Watson used a new "management-style scale" to measure C, IS, and the leader's ability to provide resources. Self, superior, and subordinate leadership ratings were used. C and IS were independent for all three referents but provision of resources was typically correlated with both C and IS. (r's in the .3 to .4 range). Subjects were asked to select the 10 most important items from the leadership measure. Watson commented on the psychometric characteristics of the "most important" and less important items. Particularly interesting was his observation that the items which would be retained on the basis of the results of "item analysis" are not necessarily those indicated by respondents as being most important. He argued that we should not be so ready to discard items which fail the traditional criteria based on item analysis. Other criteria (e.g., perceived importance to the respondent) should be considered.

He reported a mixed pattern of relationships with objective performance measures such as sales/employee. The relationships involved both leader behavior and diary items such as time spent on the job, time spent with superiors, and the like. As with the previous contributors, these findings suggest the potential importance of a broader range of managerial behavior than those treated in traditional leadership studies. Watson also raised questions regarding casual directions and suggested time-lagged longitudinal studies to address this point. As will be seen, this point came up several times throughout the conference. It has also preoccupied US leadership researchers for some years.

Values and Social Reality

"Culture" provided the integrating theme for this session. The first contributor was largely concerned with the cultural context in which managers act - how that context affects what they do and the consequences of their behavior. The second two contributors were more concerned with what managers and leaders do to culture - how they shape it and use it, e.g., as a basis for mobilizing effort and support, legitimizing selected activities, etc. Both examined leaders as creators of organizations and their roles in managing transitions.

Pat Terry contributed a paper entitled "English Culture and Management Behavior." He began by noting that management and organization theorists have tended to ignore the importance of the cultural context in which they have conducted research and theory development. He continued by reviewing definitions of culture, identifying nine principal attributes which form a model - providing the basis for a study of culture.

Terry briefly outlined an empirical program of research into the "traits" of English culture and his attempts to link those traits to managerial behavior. His methodology was somewhat unusual for research in the area of leadership and managerial behavior. A mixture of questionnaires, interviews, attitude scales, and content analysis of historical references (to identify English "traits") were employed, along with an analysis of a study published over 20 years ago by Gorer (1951).

Analysis revealed 14 "character traits", e.g., conservatism, tenacity, pragmatism, reserve. Twelve of these were argued to be clearly linked to managerial behavior. From these findings and reasoning, Terry concluded that many aspects of behavior in organizations may be "largely culturally influenced." He felt that individually based training or development might provide little help in alleviating organizational problems which are impor-- tantly affected by the cultural context in which they occur.

Andrew Pettigrew followed, with a presentation of a paper entitled "Symbolic and Political Aspects of Leadership." It was based on Pettigrew's well-known work on political processes in organizations (Pettigrew 1973; 1975; 1977), but particular use was made of a recent longitudinal-processual study of the birth and evolution of a school (Pettigrew 1979). The formally appointed heads of this school were taked to be leaders and a broad range of activity was judged to constitute leadership. Again, the methodology is not one which typifies research in the general area of leadership and managerial behavior. While it is consistent with an emerging trend in America for longitudinal studies (see, e.g., Hunt and Larson, Eds 1979) its use of Turner's notion of "social dramas" is most unusual in 'mainstream' leadership research.

Pettigrew noted that his interest was with 'what the leader makes' rather than what makes the leader. He began by describing what he saw to be seven core leadership tasks: creating energy and purpose; generating commitment; creating order and control; legitimating the organization with its external environment; competing for scare resources; legitimizing and justifying actions already taken; and justifying and maintaining continuity. His analysis is consistent with the work of, e.g., Sayles (1964), Selznick (1957), Etzioni (1965), and the conference contribution made by Hosking (see Hosking and Hunt 1980).

Pettigrew continued by arguing that a key aspect of leadership behavior is that involved with interventions in political contexts - contexts where different interest groups have competing claims over resource allocation. He suggested that in managing political processes, leaders are involved in the "management of meaning." In other words they will, for example, seek to modify demands by creating legitimacy for certain ideas, values and demands, and delegitimizing others. They will do this through the use of symbols, metaphors, myths, rituals, etc. - thereby creating and modifying (when necessary) the organizational culture. Central to the process is the development and use of power - only by doing so can leaders achieve the tasks listed earlier.

6

The third presentation was by Iain Mangham and was entitled "Interaction in Theatrical Enterprises: Some Features of Communication and Authority in Artistic Organizations." This was the preliminary report of a study only recently begun using dramaturgical analysis, and in that sense similar to the methodology of Pettigrew's school study. Mangham's introductory and intriguing observation was that putting on a play constitutes a practical organizational achievement - an achievement based on agreed and understood ways of doing things. In analyzing this achievement he focused on the relationship between the actors (viewed in some sense as subordinates) and the director (viewed as the leader).

It was argued that what directors do in this relationship is to use a variety of devices for reducing uncertainty and ambiguity - constructing definitions for actors and providing a necessary degree of structure. Mangham outlined his interview findings which indicate how actors perceive the role of director: for example, a director must be authoritative and directive but not to such a degree that actors have no say in how things are done (structuring but also high in "tolerance for freedom" as per the LBDQ Form XII?).

Again, there seemed to be some parallels with Andrew Pettigrew's work, leaders as manipulators of meaning and shapers of culture. There was also some evidence of the need to engage in political activity. For example, if a director wants to rework a particular scene he might have to negotiate the rejection of a week's work - political skills indeed (though not in Pettigrew's sense).

Intervention in Organizations: Conceptual and Practical Issues

There were three contributions in this session, their common theme being a concern with the utilization of leadership research in organizations. Margerison put it well in his presentation, "Practical Research in Management and Organization," when he argued that though much management research has been done, a great deal has gone unnoticed and unused in organizations. This concern has also been expressed with increasing frequency with regard to leadership research in the US. As an example, a substantial portion of the most recent leadership symposium book, *Crosscurrents in Leadership* (Hunt and Larson, 1979) focused on this issue. It was also at the core of a controversy in a review of *Leadership: The Cutting Edge* (Hunt and Larson, 1977) (see Campbell, 1979; Hunt, 1979).

Margerison described an approach used by those at his institution to try to deal with the above concern. Essentially the research is longitudinal (1 to 3 years) and built around a convergence of researcher interest and client-defined needs. This differs from many consulting arrangements in that considerable effort is made to utilize projects which allow application of recent behavior science findings. It differs from traditional academic research in that client problems and needs are given heavy emphasis.

7

As part of Margerison's presentation, Andrew Kakabadse described the way in which such action research was conducted in a sample of banks. A number of political as well as research issues involved in this kind of research were illustrated in his contribution.

This set the stage for Kakabadse's major presentation, "Studies of Social Service Organisations." In this he described a four-stage study emphasizing structural and climate variables within a social services department of a metropolitan district authority. The study used a combination of questionnaires and interview items based on recent work in the organization theory/behavior area. A part of it touched on the managerial opportunities and constraints area which is such an important part of Rosemany Stewart's work reported above.

Using the study described as a background, Kakabadse then discussed the issues involved in getting the findings accepted and utilized within the organization. This is of course quite a different issue from that encountered in most academic research where implementation of findings has a low priority.

Jan Geersing's presentation, "Leadership and Participation: Implications for Action Research," complemented the earlier ones and was used to conclude the session. Like the earlier contributions, his work was initially client inspired. However, if the previous presentations placed a heavy weight on client acceptance and implementation, Geersing came down more heavily on the side of traditional academic research values. While application of the findings was of interest to him, he did not emphasize this issue. His research focused on possible organizational and socio-psychological influences of worker participation on decision-making outcomes of importance to them. Data were obtained from an insurance company, a hospital, and a printing and publishing firm. He described a model using selected structure and task factors, leader consideration and initiating structure, and motivation to participate, to predict participation and satisfaction with participation. Geersing's model is a causal one even though his data are cross-sectional in nature. This stimulated extensive discussion which is summarized, along with other discussion issues, towards the end of this report.

Leadership: Its Past, Present and Future

In view of the issues and themes which had emerged from previous workshops and discussions, Frank Heller took on the ambitious task of trying to isolate some of the main problems and demands and relate them to his own research of the last 10 or 15 years.

He began by selecting some of the points and criticisms made by both Hosking (see session on fundamental issues) and Dachler (see summary of discussion issues). These were described as "trapdoors" causing leadership theories and research to "leave the stage." Ten such traps were identified:

8

(1) Leadership has become a ragbag - a term applied to very diverse phenomena; (2) The "Law of the Instrument" has all too often prevailed, resulting in available methods determining lines of research rather than vice versa-- this was put in the more general context of a 'positivist' tradition which was seen as a burden; (3) Too great a focus on the individual as the level of analysis; (4) Tendencies to assume 'rational' actors; (5) A pronounced managerial orientation leading, for example, to biased views about organizational goals, leadership tasks, and effectiveness criteria; (6) The too-frequent use of a dependent variable-independent variable approach; (7) Glib assumptions about directions of causation with little attempt to test them; (8) A subject-oriented rather than problem-oriented tradition; (9) A tendency to search for variables of economic success - which we have not done very well at; and (10) The dominant research strategy of conducting cross-sectional studies to the neglect of longitudinal analyses.

Heller continued by summarizing very briefly some half-dozen research projects in which he had been involved in order to demonstrate ways in which he had attempted to avoid "disappearing from the stage." The first four studies had as their starting-point a project designed to examine leadership in South American organizations. This was begun at the time that Likert's "system-4" ideas on participative management were fashionable. Heller and his colleagues failed to find much support for Likert's ideas in this context and so took a rather more complex view in their next study. This time they included moderator variables in the design and expanded Likert's four systems into five. They found empirical support for their model, the findings then being replicated in the United Kingdom. Again, the research model was extended: first, to include a new variable - "skill under-utilization"; and second, to examine relationships in different countries (eight, to be exact) in order to test possible cross-national differences.

A number of intriguing findings emerged from these studies (e.g., that subordinates typically see themselves as having more influence on the nature of a particular decision than their own boss believes). In order to make greater sense of these results, Heller and his colleagues conducted a longitudinal study of decision-making. They identified four stages in decision-processes and looked to see if the amount of power-sharing engaged in varied over time. As one might have intuitively supposed, variations were found. Had traditional 'snapshot' correlational techniques been employed these variations would have been totally obscured.

Heller concluded by outlining two current projects, one of which clearly shows the existence and importance of "meta-power systems" - systems in some sense outside the organization which influence activities within the organization. Clearly an approach which focused on individuals or situational variables to the neglect of more macro, contextual variables would have missed this. The second study is being conducted in an organization consisting of semiautonomous groups - again the importance of the leadership context is revealed. A major issue raised by this research concerns the manager's views of his authority in the context of such groups.

Micro and Macro Approaches

The three contributors to this session all dealt with a wide range of variables seen as characterizing the leadership context. In this they are consistent with recent pleas by some in the US (e.g., Hunt and Larson, 1975, 1977, 1979). Such pleas, though, have had only limited success in that country. By and large, the range of variables considered by most US models has been relatively restricted.

The first of these presentations was by Keith Thurley and Hans Wirdenius and was entitled "Leadership: A Production Systems Perspective." The heart of their approach was disturbance control by a supervisor within a production system. They argued that a supervisor's major function is to deal with disturbances of deviations from the expected flow of production which is judged to imply negative consequences.

Thurley and Wirdenius broadened this idea into that of a "steering system." The steering function for any production system was defined in terms of the exercise of power in controlling disturbances in the system performance. It was argued that this function could be carried out by others i addition to the supervisor. However, they defined supervisors as those who spend most of their time carrying out the steering function. They then showed 2 of 15 models which vary in terms of the relative importance of the steering function for different kinds of production systems.

Production system characteristics were seen to vary in terms of complexity, and the nature of the steering function was evaluated in terms of its criticality and frequency requirements. They argued that these served as critical contingencies in evaluating the effectiveness of supervisors and in determining the relative mix and appropriateness of participative begavior among the various parties involved in the steering function. They concluded by applying their model to several newly instituted production operations in Ireland.

Another comprehensive but more macro-oriented presentation was "Leadership and Managerial Orientation in Construction Management" by Thelma Quince and Peter Lansley. Their presentation dealt with senior managers in small, medium, and large firms in the British construction industry. The firms were sampled after a period which had seen an average 30 percent decline in orders. Thus, the managers were sampled at a time when their strategic behavior was particularly important. Quince and Lansley essentially focused on the managerial and organizational factors which influenced the ability of these firms to cope with the severe drop in demand.

The background against which senior managers' leader behavior was judged consisted of (1) structural opportunities for them to display leadership, e.g., functional specialization, technical expertise requirements, complexity of internal and external organizational relationships; (2) the nature of the problem situation, e.g., level of uncertainty, level of unfamiliarity, speed necessary for solution; (3) their orientation's emphasis on corporate,

external, internal, moral, and political concerns. Using these consideration, Quince and Lansley evaluated the relative performance of their sample of firms.

The final presentation was by Hunt and Osborn and was entitled "A Multiple Influence Model of Leadership." They described a model they had been developing for the last few years, and the results of empirical tests recently conducted with a sample of US Army telecommunication units. The model includes consideration of the following variables: (1) environmental, e.g., socioeconomic characteristics, other organizations; (2) contextual, e.g., size and technological sophistication; (3) structural, e.g., vertical specialization and control; (4) group, task, and individual-difference characteristics; and (5) leadership. The latter is considered in terms of both vertical leader-subordinate interactions and lateral interactions with those at or near the same level. Vertical leadership is further considered in terms of discretionary (that over and above the role) and required (that specified by the role). The environmental, contextual, and structural variables are collapsed into three separate indices of complexity. Each of these is hypothesized to interact with leadership in influencing performance and satisfaction.

We might add that Hunt's and Osborn's notion of discretionary leadership seems to share some similarities with the idea of a steering function as developed by Thurley and Wirdenius. In addition, complexity was treated as an important variable in all three contributions to the session.

Sharing Decision-Making

This session was characterized by the following themes: First, consideration of what leadership roles and tasks consist of; second, how important role or task performance of this sort is, and in particular - the degree to which it is effective for individuals (e.g., in terms of job satisfaction), organizations, and societies (e.g., in terms of the time taken to reach quality decisions). All three contributors were concerned with changing requirements for leadership: as the locus of authority shifts away from formally appointed position-holders (at least as traditionally viewed) to being distributed more evenly within organizations - how does this affect leadership?

Roy Madron was concerned with "Leading an Open Democracy." He focused on decision-making processes in local government authorities and found them wanting when judged against democratic ideals. (By the people, for the people...). He argued that an "Open Process" was required which would enable a "good fit" between the actions taken by the council, the needs and aspirations of local people, and the external environment. This he saw as making significant new demands on leaders. While he made it clear that the leader should adopt a problem-owner role, he was not sure what that role would look like.

11

He argued that in local government at present, public consultation and participation do not occur until immediately before implementation of 'agreed' policies. In his view this meant that participation occurred at a stage in the decision-making process in which it could only be disruptive. He felt that this situation was to be deplored and required some remedy. An "open process" was advocated whereby public participation began at the stage of "problem definition." This was seen as being likely to encourage commitment, rapid implementation of plans, and avoidance of the domination of certain interest groups. The question was then posed - what kinds of leaders are required for an open democracy of this sort. It was suggested that they would need to (1) be able to involve people in policies and decision-making on an everyday basis, (2) identify and proclaim social and economic goals in order to get elected, and (3) achieve a "fit" between the ends of individuals, the environment, and 'society'.

Obviously the question arises as to whether or not leadership theorists and researchers can develop an adequate specification of leadership requirements in such systems. What sort of behavior and skills will they need? The importance of political skills had been stressed by some contributors in earlier discussions (see e.g., Hosking, Morley, Pettigrew). Discussion of authority relations had also occurred (see e.g., Mangham). This seems an important area for future development.

Peter Forsblad presented "Some Changes in Swedish Industry and Labour Relations - a Case for Leadership Research." He began by outlining four areas in which radical changes had occurred and were continuing to occur. The first was in the design of production systems. The last 10 years have seen the increasing use of small, relatively autonomous group working at their own pace; group-working established along the flow of production; and changes in technology which allow some production systems to be entirely mechanized (using, e.g., self-powering carriers and mechanical robots.

Changes in work organization on a more macro scale were also identified. In particular, Forsblad pointed to the newly prevailing principle of decentralization and associated increases in small units, profit-centers and devolved authority for action. These in turn are associated with new forms of coordination and control.

Worker participation was said to be being extended at three levels: shop-floor (individuals are having more influence over their own jobs); company (increasing employee representation on decision-making bodies); and financial (more workers sharing ownership of their companies). It was suggested that these developments are affecting employees' expectations, e.g., of their roles vis-à-vis their managers and supervisors.

At the same time as these changes have been occurring, peoples' attitudes towards their work have been changing. Forsblad cited evidence which suggested that work is being seen as less central and less important than it once was. It seems that in Sweden, at least, there is a move away from the work ethic towards what Goldthorpe and Lockwood (1968) called an "instrumental orientation" towards work.

Having outlined these changes, Forsblad argued that they had substantial
implications for our knowledge of leadership and supervision in production
systems. Future research and theory-building would need to take these de-
velopments into account. He argued that existing contingency theories em-
phasize the wrong sorts of factors and tend to be "timeless." He advocated
the analysis of conditions which facilitate or restrict leadership and pointed
to the relevance and possible utility of Rosemary Stewart's work on supports
and constraints affecting managerial activity. Kerr and Jermier's work
on "substitutes" for leadership would also have some relevance here.

Sigvard Rubenowitz presented a paper entitled "The Impact of Managerial
Behaviour on Members' Participation in Swedish Plants - Some Research Results."
This was a preliminary report of an extensive survey of 10 Swedish plants.
The general purpose of the study was to examine to what degree, and under
what conditions, different participation systems produce expected increases
in job satisfaction, productivity, etc. The research design was of the
input, moderator, output variety. Various types of "formal participation"
were treated as inputs having independent and interactive effects on "per-
ceived participation." Perceived participation was evaluated by three in-
dices and by an index of "general participation climate." The latter re-
flected relationships between employees and their immediate superior: per-
ceptions of his/her leadership style, frequency of conflicts, and control
in own job situation. (In some ways this index is rather similar to the
content of the "consideration" subscale of the LBDQ.) Individual and or-
ganizational characteristics were also treated as moderator variables af-
fecting relations between formal participation and "effects" such as indi-
vidual satisfaction with work, satisfaction with work-group cohesion, general
job satisfaction, productivity, etc.

It was not possible for Rubenowitz to do justice in his findings with
a short time for presentation. Instead he focused on those factors which
seemed most highly related to the effect variables. Perhaps most interesting
was the observation that the "perceived general participation climate" -
as assessed by vertical participation or leadership style of the "consider-
ation" sort - showed the most sizable relationships with effect variables.
For example, it correlated +.53 with satisfaction with "company spirit"
and +.46 with "general commitment."

Rubenowitz concluded that good relations of this sort "seem to be the
most important prerequisite for genuine shop floor participation. Formal
representative participation proved to have small or no impact." Consequently,
moves towards participation in workplace organization do not seem to have
reduced the importance of superior-subordinate relations at the level of
production. We may note that supervisors, in performing leadership roles
or tasks at this level, may have to do different things and face different
constraints than those they would face in more traditional forms of work
organization. However, the importance of their role does not seem to be

13

diminished. This observation contributes to the debate current among
American researchers that leadership (in an unspecified sense) is usually
of little significance (see, e.g., Vaill 1978; Pfeffer and Salancik 1975;
Pfeffer 1978).

Skills and Skill Development

The three presentations in this session focused on the skills involved
in leadership behavior. Though this work has been emphasized in Britain
since the 1960s, it has only recently begun to receive attention in the
United States. Argyris (1979), for example, has argued that traditional
questionnaire measures based on instruments such as the Leader Behavior
Description Questionnaire (Stogdill, 1963, 1974) do not really focus on
measurable behavior. For example, a typical item "he does little things
to make it pleasant to be a member of the group," leaves much to be desired
in terms of specificity.

This US concern has been partly in response to the lack of criterion
variance accounted for in much current leadership research and is illustrated
by work reported in Hunt and Larson (1979). The presentations here take
a different and more detailed perspective than current US work. As part
of a long-term research emphasis, they appear to be at the cutting edge
of work in this area.

Wright and Taylor set the tone in "The Interpersonal Skills of Leader-
ship: A Conceptual Framework." They argued that leadership skills can
be analyzed at three levels: (1) micro (words, phrases, gestures, etc.
in interaction with one or more followers) referred to as components; (2)
structural (longer interactions covering a number of different points);
and (3) macro (similar clusters of components and/or structural devices
which occur regularly together and which identify a recognizable set of
approaches to manager-subordinate interactions. The latter is perhaps most
akin to what is tapped in traditional questionnaire measures.

Wright and Taylor argued that interactions between these levels are
crucial. It is of little use attempting to change behavior at the macro-
level unless the component skills are also developed. Even though a man-
ager now knows he should be paticipative, that is not very helpful unless
he knows how to modify the lower-level components. At the same time,
learning the lower-level components only appears random unless there is
a unifying theme brought about by the higher level behaviors.

Gerald Randell pursued this theme still further in "The Chasm between
Theory and Practice in Leadership." His thesis is essentially that most
teachers of leadership theories seem to be of the view that teaching an
understanding of the models to managers is sufficient for them to display
the appropriate behaviors. He continued by developing an approach designed

14

to bridge the gap between knowledge and successful implementation. In this
he argued that the objectives of a given managerial behavior must be expressed
in precise operational terms. Furthermore, managers must be encouraged
to want to become more skillful. Finally, tutored practical work training
must be established so the skills can be developed. He pointed out that
the behaviors are not "neutral" and so considerable care must be given to
the way in which these sensitive behaviors are learned.

The final presentation was by Beverly Alban Metcalfe and entitled,
"Leadership - Who Does What to Whom and How." Consistent with the two
earlier presentations, she was concerned with trying to determine as ac-
curately as possible what a leader does, how he does it, and to what ef-
fect. She argued that current studies have been extremely inaccurate in
the way in which they define and operationalize leader behavior. To achieve
her goal of moving beyond these studies she used the appraisal interview
as the focus of attention. Consistent with the work of Graen (e.g., Graen
and Cashman, 1975) in the United States, she thus focused on the leader-
subordinate dyad. In order to learn more about leadership and its effects
in this situation she treats the situation as a process, the quality of
which is a function of the supervisor's transactional skills. These in-
clude the quality and amount of participation, the supervisor's sensitivity
to the subordinate's needs as expressed in the nature of the transactions,
and the subordinate's response to them. It is anticipated that knowledge
gained from this particular situation should then help in analyzing other
common supervisor-subordinate dyadic work situations.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS - INTEGRATED SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES

One of the most pervasive, but often underlying themes of the confer-
ence was that concerned with the meaning of the terms leader, leadership,
and managerial behavior. It rapidly became apparent that people used the
terms in many different ways, but on the whole, did not see this as a problem.

A fairly popular view was that leadership can properly and profitably
be viewed as a subset of management. Having said this, few attempted to
seriously distinguish leadership and managerial behaviors. Discussion of
related distinctions, for example, between leadership and headship, or be-
tween "required" and "discretionary" leadership revealed how difficult
it is to draw boundaries around such terms. If this seemed true when trying
to produce well-defined concepts, it seemed even more so when trying to
operationalize them.

Related questions of whether leadership can only be performed by appointed
officials and whether it is necessarily focused in one individual within
a particular subsystem were also raised. Persons such as Hosking, Dachler,
and Thurley and Wirdenius clearly believed in the distributive perspective.
Unfortunately, in discussions of these matters it was not always clear
whether leadership was seen as distributed or whether it was seen to be
essentially focused in e.g., the supervisor but supplemented by "substitutes."

The question of whether or not leadership is a unitary concept was
returned to - often in rather subtle ways - throughout discussions at the
conference. One view, expressed early in the proceedings, was to distin-
guish different usages and meanings of the term and develop mid-range
theories for each. Another, in some ways opposing position, was that if
the term does not have conceptual status, it is unlikely to provide much
'mileage' and should be rejected in favor of more fundamental constructs.
Offers of alternatives included the notion of a "steering function" - de-
veloped by Thurley and Wirdenius. Discussions tended to focus on how this
differed from other, seemingly similar terms. The question was raised as
to why it was necessary to invent a new concept. Attempts to answer this
led to consideration of changes in work organizations, and in particular,
changing supports and constraints. For example, it was often observed that
these changes have a profound impact on the supervisor's role (as a leader
or whatever).

At least one contributor placed the question of definitions firmly
in the context of objectives -- depending on the purpose of one's research
and/or attempts at theory development, certain definitions are made more
appropriate and others less so. This sort of argument seemed implicit in
the view, expressed by at least two contributors, who questioned why aca-
demics should seek to distinguish between leadership and management if
managers seldom make such distinctions. Such arguments prompted concerted
debate regarding objectives for research and theory development: for ex-
ample, one 'school' of thought was that researchers in the area should be-
come much more client oriented and more problem oriented. Presumably one
major concern of many clients is in the area of increasing leadership
(managerial) effectiveness. This issue was central to the contributions
to the skills session (see the summary given earlier). It was also empha-
sized by Hunt and Osborn who set out to develop a model which would increase
the amount of explained variance in performance and satisfaction outcomes.

Increasing concern with leadership in participative work organizations
may provide one example of client oriented research. One issue raised in
this context reflects the definitional debate described above: what do
the terms leader and leadership mean in participative settings? Questions
were raised regarding who sets the agenda, who holds the information, who
really makes the decisions, etc.

Perhaps it is not surprising that discussions of this sort led to con-
sideration of leadership as a political process. Leaders were examined
as members of an elite, having privileged access to information, or not
having the necessary information but being unable to 'admit' this for
reasons of the elite status. Political processes in the context of collec-
tive problem-solving and decision-making were also examined. Examples were
given of cases where appointed officials (leaders? certainly "heads")
steered discussion away from courses of action which were less desirable
for them, i.e., their agenda was one of 'personal rationality' rather than
'organizational rationality.'

16

Decision-making was also discussed from other perspectives. For example a considerable amount of time was devoted to pragmatic problems of identifying decisions, and determining when such processes 'start' and 'stop'. The need to treat decision avoidance as a deliberate and selected option which might actually have positive payoffs (depending on how payoffs are measured and against whose criteria) was also discussed.

Issues of competence and expertise (both perceived and 'actual') were given an airing. A number of discussants gave examples of situations where second-level managers have little awareness of the sorts of activities their first-line supervisors engage in, and see them as exercising less responsibility and control than they actually do. As one person suggested, this may be a defensive reaction on the part of the superior. Interestingly, it may also point to the ignorance of persons in some sense 'outside' production systems of the sorts of steering functions which often have to be performed.

The concept of rationality also received some discussion; for example, consideration was given to its use in research on decision-making and the ways in which certain procedures in organizations may encourage managers to take actions which look irrational to those who adopt the rational-man model (assuming that the decision-maker's objectives must be of a certain sort, etc., cf. Allison's analysis of the Cuban Missile Crisis). Observations such as these may certainly lead one to question the general validity and utility of prescriptive packages based on normative models of the rational man (e.g., Kepner-Tregoe's "Rational Manager").

One common theme is research and models of problem-solving and decision-making concerns the use of a systematic, structured approach. The term "structure" came up in many different contexts during the conference and attempts were made to distinguish different usages of the term and their associated implications. One familiar usage was seen to be that employed by Fiedler (1967): "structured" tasks – at least operationally – being production-type tasks, and "unstructured" being of the problem-solving/ creativity type. A number of contributors pointed to logics which would result in very different classifications of such tasks, when the term "structure" is used differently. Distinctions were drawn between structuring of: problems or tasks; processes to be followed; and roles or positions within organizations. The functions and consequences of structure (in these various senses) were also examined, for example, in coping with complex and changing environments.

Another issue which was returned to on a number of occasions concerned the relative neglect of time as a variable in research. Particular importance was attached to the need for longitudinal programs and processual analysis. The literature documenting phase-changes and their significance was examined (e.g., Sample and Wilson 1965) and it was concluded that more research of this kind was needed. However, as was pointed out, the identification of phases is no easy matter. On what basis should phases be defined,

17

by arbitrary chunking into equal time intervals, by observation, or...?
Conceptual schemes are seldom developed for this purpose. One contributor
gave a personal example demonstrating the need for research of this kind.
He described a case where, when 'time-collapsed' data were disaggregated,
sizable and meaningful relationships were found between decision-processes
and outcomes. One interesting and related possibility which was not explored
is that one of the more "micro" skills of effective leadership may be to
manage phase shifts appropriately (see, for example, Douglas 1957, 1962).

Time was also examined as a factor which influences the timing and
selection of behavioral options. While the issue did not receive detailed
discussion, examples of both 'psychological/subjective' time (e.g., perceptions
of a crisis - need to act quickly - see Janis' analysis of Victims of Group-
think, Janis 1972) and 'real' time (the end of a budget period or period
in office - how this affects what one does or does not do) were explored.
It was noted that studies relevant to some of these issues were to be found
in the literatures on management control and business policy - how deadlines
associated with different accounting and control procedures can encourage
behaviors aimed at 'maximizing' in the short-term rather than the long-term.

The question of time was also discussed in quite a different way in
the context of longitudinal studies. For example, Quince and Lansley described
some of the problems they encountered in conducting a longitudinal study
during a recession. Not only did they have problems in obtaining firms
(often found to be more difficult in terms of economic hardship), but they
faced the further problem of generalizing to non-recession periods.

Simulation was suggested as a way of compensating for this. The looking-
glass simulation developed by McCall and Lombardo (1978) serves as one ex-
ample. Some applications of it were to have been included in the conference
program before it had to be reorganized. The simulation involves three
firms in the glass industry under sharply differing conditions of environ-
mental stability. It is set up to allow for observation and measurement
of a wide range of leadership and managerial behavior in the three organiza-
tions. Such a simulation might well make the work of those such as Quince
and Lansley easier.

One of the many merits of a high-fidelity simulation is that it allows
one to observe behaviors under a wide range of conditions. This may be
a source of assistance to those who believe that our attempts to measure
leadership behaviors are less than adequate. This view was expressed by
a great many. However, less consensus was revealed in ideas of what to
do about it. More than a few called for the consideration of a wider
range of leader behaviors; some argued for the inclusion of "political"
and "ideological" categories; others suggested that in some contexts,
behaviors might be so situation-specific that general measures would be
insufficiently sensitive.

These sorts of discussion inevitably led to the, by now, familiar de-
bate on methodologies and levels of analysis. Some argued over the relative
merits of the so-called psychometric versus impressionistic approaches,

while others saw the 'battle lines' as being much less clearly drawn. The latter tended to regard each as a set of beliefs and associated techniques, both having strengths and weaknesses. People's views on the degree to which the approaches were complementary seemed to profoundly affect their judgments as to the feasibility and desirability of multidisciplinary research. Only a small minority seemed to feel the need for a multidisciplinary approach and of these, a number bemoaned the difficulties seemingly inherent in such an enterprise. Those who were actively engaged in an approach of this sort seemed somewhat pessimistic about the possibility that it would be fruitful.

OVERVIEW

This was provided by Richard Osborn from the Battelle Human Affairs Research Centre in the United States. He concentrated on comparing and contrasting the treatment of leadership at this European conference with the way in which it is typically treated by American scholars. In doing so he focused on three broad questions: (1) who owns leadership? (2) what is leadership? and (3) to what extent is there a search for a unifying concept?

Who Owns Leadership?

Here, in contrast to the United States, leadership seems to be seen more as a construct and less as a distinct area of study. Osborn argued that in Europe a number of parties other than academicians may claim an interest in leadership. For example, both government and unions may "own" it via interests in participation. The focus is then on a collection of individuals sharing the common property. Issues of power and conflict between institutions may be involved.

Top management constitutes another interested party. Here, Osborn argued, leadership action and effects are not clearly differentiated. The issues studied are those defined by top management rather than those of conceptual importance as defined by the researcher. Furthermore, often an area is studied because there is a political commitment that it is important. Again, participation serves as an example. In the European context it often appears to be focused on, not because it is of empirical or conceptual importance but because there is a political commitment to it on the part of some influential agency.

Osborn argued that, to the extent these observations are true, the agenda for what is to be studied may not be in the hands of the researcher. The area of concern is highly political and outside parties will claim an interest and therefore, in Osborn's sense, ownership rights.

One question raised by these observations is whether or not researchers want to own leadership. In America, the answer has been a resounding "yes" - whereas this seems much less the case in Europe. Osborn's feeling was

that if researchers (wherever they are) want to stake out a claim to leadership they might attempt to do so within the area of organizational analysis. This would put it within a much broader context than is presently found in the US - the United States approaches having a strong psychological orientation. As a part of organizational analysis, leadership would also enhance its visibility and credibility as a scholarly field, and would enable clearer distinctions to be made between phenomena which are at present covered by the same catch-all term. Interested parties might then be in a position to pick and choose between the various phenomena to be investigated, rather than taking them 'on board', often unknowingly, as a part and parcel of their focus.

What is Leadership?

This question is related to the previous one concerned with ownership. Osborn pointed to the violent disagreement between participants over what leadership entails. Some appeared to believe it to be a complete chimera. Many apparently wished to define it as something more than interaction - and not necessarily face to face at that (e.g., a memo could communicate leadership). Osborn agreed with those who felt that leadership could be embodied in a collectivity or institution. He also accepted that it includes more than just 'vertical' relations between superiors and subordinates.

Osborn continued by noting that leadership is always performed in the context of other, nonleadership, activities. In the US it has often been studied as if it were separate from the functions in which the leader is engaged. Here there is an analogy to the broader study of management. There are some who argue that management is a distinct enough activity so that it can be studied as such. Hence management courses and even management schools or management centers. Others argue it can only be studied in the context in which it occurs. Hence, sales management, production management and the like. As Osborn suggested earlier, the European emphasis appears to be much more heavily on studying leadership *in situ*.

Osborn suggested that it might be useful to study leadership in terms of "patterning of activities", achieved through focusing attention on particular goals and paths to those goals, and by reinforcing behaviors which contribute to their achievement. Such a perspective assumes that leadership does not constitute a set of distinct actions separable from other, different actions (e.g., management). A specific action derives its status as an act of leadership by virtue of its being part of a pattern or sequence which cuts across areas of activity. Some underlying policy and strategy is therefore implied in any act which is deemed to constitute leadership.

One way in which this patterning of activities is achieved is by attracting the attention of involved parties and focusing their attention on interrelated goals. In other words, leadership involves defining what is important and communicating ways of achieving targets so indicated.

Leadership also involves establishing contacts and relationships which provide the means for exchange. This is particularly obvious in the area of lateral contacts between subsystems in organizations (see e.g., Sayles 1964).

Another way in which leadership is manifested is by developing orientations or typical ways of doing things, e.g., of solving problems. This again represents patterning of activities. Use of rewards to reinforce particular ways of doing things helps to establish patterns or structures and helps to focus the attention of managers and subsystems.

Osborn speculated that those who are unwilling to pattern activities, focus attention, and reinforce selectively do not practice leadership. If this is the case, it would be possible to arrive at some global estimate of an individual's leadership by assessing how much patterning is in existence over and above some 'typical' level.

It was felt that such a perspective had the advantage of allowing integration of the many definitions of leadership found in different studies. Against this, such a global view clearly lacks precision and encompasses a great many, possibly unmeasurable dimensions. Osborn offered these suggestions as an attempt to help those active in the area to communicate more effectively. He felt that if only we could adopt an approach similar to that found in economics - one which cuts across different interest groups - this would make the way forward easier.

Concern for a Unifying Concept

Continuing his comparisons between European and American approaches, Osborn commented that in the United States there is considerable emphasis given to need for a unifying paradigm. Arguments are increasingly being voiced that the field is too narrow and sterile - new directions are needed (see e.g., Hunt and Larson 1977, 1979). On the other hand, the conference contributions and discussions indicated that European researchers adopt such diverse perspectives that they have difficulty in communicating with each other. For example, discussions of methodology showed substantial areas of disagreement. In his view these disagreements were often over constructs rather than methodology - but this tended not to be noticed.

These and other observations led Osborn to conclude that 'the field' is considerably more heterogeneous in Europe than in the US. Such heterogeneity has its good and bad points. It may be that American approaches lack sufficient diversity; on the other hand, there seems so much diversity in Europe that researchers are unable to engage in productive exchanges. He concluded his overview by asking first, could we overcome these difficulties with a common discipline; and second, are conditions such that a discipline could be established?

Osborn's overview succeeded in provoking a lively and wide-ranging discussion taking in issues of ownership (see earlier); the meaning and possible utility of conceptualizing leadership in terms of patterning of activities; and different meanings associated with leadership in the context, e.g., of cooperatives or collectives. The advantages and disadvantages of homogeneous versus heterogeneous perspectives were touched upon and reinforced many of the issues raised in Hosking's presentation in the session on fundamental issues.

His overview also prompted some interesting analogies to be drawn, e.g., between the current 'state of the art' in leadership and possibly similar states in other areas of concern. Madron asked if we might not be in a position similar to that of the alchemists during the centuries they subscribed to the phlogiston 'theory' of combustion. To summarize, the view was that when elements burned they gave off a substance called "phlogiston". Until the late eighteenth century, a great deal of effort went into trying to isolate this. Finally, using knowledge gained in this search of about 200 years, Lavoisier and Priestley made a breakthrough which completely discredited phlogiston theory. Many would argue that this breakthrough would have come much later, had not researchers vigorously pursued the phlogiston view.

Madron's suggestion was that current theories of leadership might share a similar status with phlogiston theory - and only by pursuing them will we reach a position whereby they can be usefully abandoned.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Some have argued that leadership is not a viable area for scholarly study. However, if the term is interpreted broadly and linked with research on managerial behavior, this is not necessarily the case. If one is to judge by the number of people attending the conference, and the even greater number indicating an interest to do so then clearly some believe it to be a viable area of concern.

The diversity of topics and issues raised in discussion suggest that leadership is seen far less homogeneously than in the United States. Such an interpretation is reinforced by Osborn's overview. While we believe it is a correct interpretation it does depend on the bases used for comparison.

Considerable homogeneity is reflected in recent American leadership symposia, and in the content of mainstream academic journals containing articles on leadership. Commentaries and books by those such as McCall and Lombardo (1978) - lamenting as they do the narrowness of US approaches - reinforce such a view. However, the role of the selection process in producing this state of affairs should be recognized. Where journals and symposia publications are concerned, the typical acceptance rate is probably around ten to fifteen percent. At the conference, almost anyone who desired to make a presentation did so.

Even with the above qualification, European contributions seem to in-
dicate a greater diversity of topics and treatments within the 'leadership'
area, than is found in the United States. It seems that the two streams
of literature complement each other. It may be that European contributions
may help to move the US studies out of the doldrums many feel them to be
in (see, e.g., Hunt and Larson 1977, 1979; McCall and Lombardo 1978).

The diversity of European approaches and perspectives has been made
obvious for the first time by this conference. Until now, no forum has
existed for bringing researchers in the area together. The conference
has made it feasible to establish a European network of leadership researchers.

A revision of this report will appear as a chapter in the leadership
symposium book covering the October 1980 symposium at Southern Illinois
University, Carbondale. In addition, the book will include a detailed chapter
by Rosemary Stewart linking managerial behavior and leadership. These
will serve as a movement toward combining European and US perspectives.
The 1982 leadership symposium will further the movement by being broadened
to include an equal split in European and US contributions as well as drawing
heavily on European and US discussants. The possibility of holding this
symposium in Europe is also being explored.

APPENDIX I

CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT

The University of Aston Management Centre is holding an informal conference/workshop on managerial behavior/leadership from 12.00-16.00, 17th May 1980.

The major objectives of this conference are to:

1. Find out who is doing scholarly work in the managerial behavior/leadership area in Britain and Europe.

2. Provide a forum for discussion and exchange of ideas with emphasis on a constructive and supportive atmosphere for interchange. This should provide opportunities to try out ill-formed ideas and interests within an informal, tentative and creative climate.

3. Explore the relationships of this work to that of the United States scholars.

To achieve these objectives, we wish to bring together those who are interested in the scholarly study of managerial behavior and leadership in the broadest sense. Thus, topics not usually associated with the behavior of managers but which have implications for such study are of special interest. In order to encourage interchange not only papers but presentations based on extended outlines are desired.

We are especially interested in presentations which cover the following:

1. The general topics which you think should be examined within the managerial behavior/leadership area and how.

2. How you think the field (as you define it) should develop (directions/futures).

3. What you are doing or plan to do in the area (personal directions).

4. How the field looks to you at present (overview).

If you are interested in attending the conference or making a presentation please telephone as soon as possible to provide details. Accommodation will be in the Management Centre's Nelson Building. It is possible that we may be able to pick up a portion of the Conference expenses for presenters. More definite information will be forthcoming on this.

We are hoping that this conference will help get a British and European network started for those interested in this area. The establishment of such a network could provide for future presentations at the Leadership Symposium originated in 1971 and held every two years at Southern Illinois University in the United States. Future symposia would thus become truly international

i

in scope and might well be held in Britain or Europe as well as the United States.

For details contact:

J.G. Hunt   Dian Marie Hosking
Distinguished Visiting Professor   Lecturer
(021) 359-3011 (Ext. 205)   (021) 359-3011 (Ext. 211)

University of Aston Management Centre
Nelson Building, Gosta Green
Birmingham, England

APPENDIX II

EUROPEAN WORKSHOP ON LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL BEHAVIOR

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Ms. Beverley Alban-Metcalfe
   University of Bradford Management Centre
   Emm Lane
   Bradford, West Yorkshire BD9 4JL
   England

2. Mr. David Butcher
   tel. 021.472.1301 (ext. 2405)
   home: 021.707.7174
   INLOGOV, University of Birmingham
   England

3. Mr. Charles Cox
   tel. 061.236.3311 (ext. 2323)
   U.M.I.S.T., Manchester, England

4. Prof. Peter Dachler
   Hochschule St. Gallen
   Guisanstrasse 11
   9010 St. Gallen
   Switzerland

5. Dr. Arthur Drucker
   tel. 01.402.8490
   home: 01.866.3130
   Chief, ARI Behavioural and Social Sciences
   Liaison Office, Dept. of the Army Research
    and Standardization Group
   Edison House
   223 Old Marylebone Road
   London NW1 5TH England

6. Dr. Peter Forsblad
   tel. 08/736 01 20
   home: 08/6366 72
   The Economic Research Institute at the
    Stockholm School of Economics (IFL)
   Sveavagen 65, Box 6501, 11383 Stockholm,
   Sweden

7. Dr. Nicholas Georgiades
   Centre for Creative Leadership
   52 Azalea Walk
   Eastcote, Pinner, HA5 2EH
   England

8. Dr. Jan Geersing
   tel. 050 115156
   home: 05907 3081
   Kananewag 2, Subfaculteit Psychologie
   State University of Groningen, Groningen
   The Netherlands

9. Dr. Frank Heller
   tel. 01.435.2662
   home: 01.883.3684
   Director, Centre for Decision-Making Studies
   The Tavistock Institute for Human Relations
   The Tavistock Centre, Belsize Lane,
   London NW3 5BA England

10. Dr. Andrew Kakabadse
    Management & Organisational Development
     Research Centre
    Cranfield School of Management
    Cranfield, Bedford MK43 OAL
    England

11. Mr. Terry Kellard

The Cottage, Cleeve Prior, Evesham
Worcester WR11 5LD
England

12. Mr. Peter Lansley
tel. 044.284.3491
telex: 826434 Ashcol 9

Ashridge Management College
Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire HP4 INS
England

13. Mr. Roy Madron
tel. 061.273.8228
home: 061.224.2139

Senior Research Fellow, Manchester Business
School, University of Manchester
Booth Street West, Manchester M15 43OAL
England

14. Prof. Iain Mangham

School of Management, University of Bath
Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY
England

15. Prof. Charles Margerison

Professor of Management Development
Cranfield School of Management
Cranfield, Bedford MD43 CAL
England

16. Ms. C. Morrison

U.W.I.S.T., Cardiff, Wales

17. Dr. Ian Morley

Department of Psychology
University of Warwick
Coventry, England

18. Mr. John McWilliams

U.M.I.S.T.
Manchester
England

19. Prof. Richard Osborn

Dept. of Administrative Sciences
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, IL 62901
U.S.A.

20. Prof. Andrew Pettigrew

Centre for Industrial & Business Studies
University of Warwick
Coventry
England

21. Mrs. Thelma Quince
tel. 044.284.3491
telex: 826434 Ashcol 9

Senior Research Officer
Ashridge Management College
Berkhampsted, Hertfordshire HP4 INS
England

22. Prof. Sigvard Rubenowitz

Dept. of Psychology, Gothenburg University
Box 14158, S-400 20 Goteborg, Sweden

23. Dr. Gerry Randell   Director of the Human Resources Group
                                     University of Bradford Management Centre
                                     Emm Lane
                                     West Yorkshire BD9 4JL
                                     England

24. Dr. Joyce Rothchild-Witt   Cornell University, U.S.A.

25. Dr. Rosemary Stewart   Oxford Centre for Management Studies
    tel. 0865 735422   Kennington, Oxford OX1 5NY
    home: 0865 735 389   England

26. Dr. Peter Storm   Faculty of Economics, State University of
                                      Groningen, Hoogbouw WSN
                                     Universiteit-complex, Paddepoel, Postbus 800
                                     Groningen, The Netherlands

27. Dr. D.S. Taylor   University of Bradford Management Centre
                                     Emm Lane
                                     Bradford, West Yorkshire BD9 4JL
                                     England

28. Dr. Pat Terry   Director of Personnel, Cummins Engines Co. Ltd.
                                     Coombe House, St. George's Square
                                     New Malden, Surrey, England

29. Prof. Keith Thurley   London School of Economics
                                     Houghton Street
                                     London WC2
                                     England

30. Mr. Tom Watson   Centre for Industrial & Business Studies
    tel. 0203 24011 (ext. 2300)   University of Warwick
    home: Moreton Morrell 333   Coventry, England

31. Dr. Hans Wirdenius   Swedish Council for Personnel Administration
                                     Sweden (contact via Keith Thurley at London
                                     School of Economics)

32. Dr. Cezary Wlodarczyk   Head of Organisation and Management Section
    tel. 717-59 or 742-93   Institute of Occupational Medicine
    home: 752-71   8 Teresy Street
                                     Lodz, Poland

33. Dr. Peter Wright   University of Bradford Management Centre
    tel. 0274 42299   Emm Lane
    home: 0274 5916 89   Bradford, West Yorkshire BD9 yDU
                                     England

34. Mr. John Chapman   University of Aston in Birmingham
                                     Management Centre, Gosta Green
                                     Birmingham B4 7DU
                                     England

35. Dr. Dian Hosking   University of Aston in Birmingham
                                  Management Centre, Gosta Green
                                  Birmingham B4 7DU
                                  England

36. Prof. Jerry Huntq   Same as above

37. Prof. John Child   Same as above - and MIRC

38. Prof. Ray Loveridge   Same as Above

39. Dr. Peter Clark   Same as above

APPENDIX III

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

Thursday 15th May

1200   Arrival and registration; Cash bar. University of Aston Manage-
                ment Centre, Nelson Building.

1245   Welcome and introduction (Lecture Theatre)

1300-1400   Lunch

1400-1600   Workshop: "Fundamental Issues":
                Peter Dachler - A Social Systems Perspective of Leadership
                Dian Hosling - The Social Psychology of Leadership - Mark I
                Ian Morley - The Social Psychology of Leadership - Mark II

                Workshop: "Some Neglected Aspects of Leadership and Managerial
                             Behavior":
                Rosemary Stewart - The Relevance of Research into Managerial
                                      Behavior for Leadership Studies.
                Cezary Wlodarczyk - Some Doubts on the Leadership Studies Concept.
                Tom Watson - Inconvenient Findings; Loose Ends or Pointers?

1600-1615   Tea

1615-1915   Plenary session* - Integration of Workshop Contributions;
                             discussion groups

                Cash bar

1900   Dinner

*All plenary sessions will take place in the lecture theatre unless otherwise
indicated.

Friday 16th May

0800-0845   Breakfast

0900-1045   Workshop: "Values and Social Reality"
                Pat Terry - English Culture and Management Behaviour
                Andrew Pettigrew - Symbolic and Political Aspects of Leadership
                Iain Mangham - Interaction in Theatrical Enterprises: Some
                Features of Co-munication and Authority

Workshop: "Interventions in Organisations: Conceptual
and Practical Issues"

Charles Margerison - Practical Research in Management Organisation
Andrew Kakabadse - Designing Social Service Organisations
Jan Geersing - Leadership and Participation: Implications
for Action Research.

1045-1100	Coffee
1100-1230	Plenary Session - Integration of Workshop contributions; discussion groups
1200-1400	Lunch

1400-1600   Workshop: "Simulation, and Managerial Decision-Making"
Frank Heller - A Multinational Study of Managerial Competence
Nickolas Georgiades - An Organisational Simulation of Managerial
Behaviour
Peter Storm - Distribution of Leadership Behaviours, Team Character
istics and Team Performance; A Simulation

1400-1600   Workshop: "Micro and Macro Approaches"
Keith Thurley& - Leadership: A Productive Systems Perspective
Hans Wirdenius
Thelma Quince& - Leadership and Managerial Orientation in
Peter Lansley   Construction Management
Jerry Hunt - A Multiple-Influence Model of Leadership

1600-1615	Tea
1615-1815	Plenary Session - Integration of Workshop Contributions; discussion groups.
1830	Cash bar
1900	Dinner

Saturday 17th May

0800-0845	Breakfast
0900-1045	Workshop: "Sharing Decision-Making"

Roy Madron - Leading an Open Democracy
Peter Forsblad - Changes in Swedish Industry and their
Implications for Leadership
Sigvard Rubenowitz - The Impact of Management-style on
Participation and Co-determination

ii

Workshop: "Skills and Skill Development"
Peter Wright& - The Interpersonal Skills of Leadership:
David Taylor   A Conceptual Framework
Gerry Randell - The Chasm Between Theory & Practice in Leadership
Beverely Alban-Metcalfe - Leadership -- Who Does What to Whom, and
                                          How?

1045-1100	Coffee
1100-1230	Plenary Session- Integration of Workshop Contributions; discussion groups
1200-1300	Cash Bar
1300-1400	Lunch (Main Building - Aston Suite - sixth floor)
1400-1600	Dick Osborn - Overview of Workshop and General Discussion
	Tea and Departure

APPENDIX IV

REFERENCES

Argyris, C.   How Normal Science Methodology Makes Leadership
1979   Research Less Additive and Less Applicable. In
                  Crosscurrents in Leadership J.G. Hunt and L.L. Lai_.n
                  (Eds) Southern Illinois University Press.

Campbell, D.   The Cutting Edge is Dull: A Review of Leadership:
1979   The Cutting Edge. Contemporary Psychology

Douglas, A   The Peaceful Settlement of Industrial and Intergroup
1962   Disputes. Journal of Conflict Resolution p. 69-81.

Douglas, A   Industrial Peacemaking. Columbia University Press,
1962   New York

Dixon, N.   On the Psychology of Military Incompetence.
1976   Jonathan Cape, London.

Dubin, R.   Supervision and Productivity: Empirical Findings
1965   and Theoretical Considerations. In Dubin, R.,
                  Homans, G., Mann and Miller, D. (Eds.) Leadership
                  and Productivity San Francisco, Chandler.

Eiser, J.R.   Cognitive Social Psychology. McGraw-Hill, London
1980a

Eiser, J.R.   Social Risk Taking, Conservatism, and the Social
1980b   Trap. Paper presented to International Workshop
                  on Social Psychology and Social Policy; European
                  Association of Experimental Social Psychology;
                  University of Kent at Canterbury, 29 March - 3 April.

Etzioni, A   Dual Leadership in Complex Organizations.
1965   American Sociological Review 30, p. 688-698.

Fiedler, F.   A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York,
1967   McGraw Hill.

Gibb, C.   An Interactional View of the Emergence of Leadership.
1958   In Gibb, C. (Ed.) Leadership, New York: Penguin.

Gibb, C.   Leadership. In Lindzey, G. and Aronson, E. (Eds.)
1969   The Handbook of Social Psychology (2nd Edition)
                  Vol. 4, Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Goldthorpe, J.,   The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour.
Lockwood, D.,   Cambridge University Press.
Bechofer, F.,
Platt, J.
1968

Gorer, G.   Exploring English Character. London: Cresset Press.
1951

Graen, G.
Cashman, J.
1975

A Role-Making Model of Leadership in Formal Organizations: A Developmental Approach. <u>In</u> Hunt, J., and Larson, L. (Eds.) <u>Leadership Frontiers</u> Kent, Ohio: Comparative Administration Research Institute, Kent State University.

Hosking, D.
Hunt, J.
1980

The Contribution of Social Psychology to the Study of Leadership. Paper given at the International Workshop on Social Psychology and Social Policy; University of Kent at Canterbury, England, April 1980.

Hunt, J.
Larson, L. (Eds.)
1975

<u>Leadership Frontiers</u> Southern Illinois University Press.

Hunt, J.
Larson, L. (Eds.)
1977

<u>Leadership: The Cutting Edge</u> Southern Illinois University Press.

Hunt, J.,
Larson, L. (Eds.)
1979

<u>Crosscurrents in Leadership</u> Southern Illinois University Press.

Jacobs, T.
1970

<u>Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations</u> Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

Janis, I.L.
1972

<u>Victims of Groupthink</u>. Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

Janis, I.,
Mann, L.
1977

<u>Decision Making: a Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice, and Commitment</u>. London, Collier MacMillan.

Katz, P.,
Kahn, R
1966 & 1978

<u>The Social Psychology of Organizations</u>. Wiley.

Kerr, S.
1976

Substitutes for Leadership: Their Meaning and Measurement. <u>In</u> Schneider, H. (Ed.) <u>American Institute of Decision Sciences Proceedings</u>.

McCall, M.
1977

Leaders and Leadership: Op Substance & Shadow In Hackman, J., Lawler, Ed., and Porter, L. (Eds.) <u>Perspectives on Behavior in Organizations</u>. New York; McGraw Hill.

McCall, M.,
Lombardo, M. (Eds.)
1978

<u>Leadership: Where Else Can We Go?</u> Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mintzberg, H.
1973

<u>The Nature of Managerial Work</u>. New York: Harper & Row.

Pettigrew, A. 1973	The Politics of Organizational Decision Making. London, Tavistock.
Pettigrew, A. 1975	Towards a Political Theory of Organizational Intervention, Human Relations, Vol. 28, No. 3.
Pettigrew, A. 1977	Strategy Formulation as A Political Process. Paper presented to the Conference on Theories of Strategy Formulation. Aix-en-Provence, 26-28 May.
Pettigrew, A. 1979	On Studying Organizational Cultures Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 4 December 1979, p. 570-581.
Pfeffer, J. 1978	The Ambiguity of Leadership. In McCall, M. and Lombardo, M. (Eds.) Leadership: Where Else Can We Go? Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Pfeffer, J., Salancik, G. 1975	Determinants of Supervisory Behavior: A Role Set Analysis. Human Relations 28 p. 139-154.
Sample, J. Wilson, T. 1965	Leader Behavior, Group Productivity and Ratings of Least Preferred Coworker. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1 p. 266-270.
Sayles, L. 1964	Managerial Behavior, McGraw Hill: New York.
Selznick, P. 1957	Leadership in Administration Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
Steinbruner, J.D. 1974	The Cybernetic Theory of Decision, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
Stewart, R. 1976	Contrasts in Management. McGraw Hill Book Company.
Streufert, S., Streufert, S. 1979	Behavior in the Complex Environment, New York, Halsted Press.
Stogdill, R.M. 1974	Handbook of Leadership, New York Free Press
Stogdill. R. 1963	Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form Xll Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University
Vaill, P. 1978	Towards a Behavioral Description of High Performing Systems. In McCall, M. & Lombardo, M. (Eds.) Leadership: Where Else Can We Go? Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

DATE
ILMED
-8